HE PROTESTANT

IARCH, 1949 Edited by Kenneth Leslie

—a tract of the Incarnation;
free, independent, non-sectarian,
unaffiliated with church or party.

EDITORIALS: 2

We Act For Peace; The Fellowship That Twists Your Arm; The New Rise of Christian Anti-Semitism

HIERARCHY OVER WASHINGTON 5
Loyalty Board Hearings
By Thomas Bledsoe

THE CHURCH-STATE ISSUE IN SPAIN 11
The Betrayal of Conscience
By The Rev. Father Clarence Duffy

"LET PEACE BREAK OUT!" 15
Peace Petition to President Truman

LIBRARY OF
Pacific Theological Seminary
APR - 5 1949
APR - 5 1949

Vol. VIII No. 4 25 cents

"It is with a great dismay that we see Jewish organizations...in America raise their voices on behalf of Cardinal Mindszenty, arch enemy of Jews in Hungary...head of a pogrom-clique...[who] made plots for a new Auschwitz."
--Central Board of Jews in Hungary; Orthodox Religious Bodies in Hungary; Hungarian Zionist Organization; Hungarian Section of the World Jewish Congress.

WE ACT FOR PEACE

History rises to make an announcement. She speaks not through historians to the learned, but through the people of China (whom historians call a "vacuum") to all of us everywhere. She turns a new page in her tattered blood-stained book and says that the time has come for our "betters" to get it through their heads that the days of passive obedience to their whims are over and done with, or to speak more plainly, for the "powers that be" to realize that their "powers" will cease to "be" when we learn that they have planned atomic war for us.

Just now these "powers" are concentrated here in America and are spreading the idea that their bombs will finish off the enemy before he can visit America. That is why they cynically make no secret of their offensive "defense." They think that the more "offense" they put into their "defense" the safer we shall all feel. The more solidly they build the foundations of fear the more wildly they swing their cutlasses around the seven seas. But one swing too many and we shall be at war. Once at war neither side will stop before the earth is a waste of bones and rubble and the droning stench of death.

This we don't want. We want life and song and bread and love and work. We mean to have these things. There is not one reason why we should not have them. So our petition to the President is a command, as from a master to a loyal servant. Bring us peace! Spend money for peace! Though your friends take offense, get peace! If necessary sacrifice your dignity, make a fool of yourself, but get this thing peace! For your people, those whom you serve, want no alternative or substitute for peace, and will take none. We have got it into our heads that you can bring this about with patience and work and the strengthening knowledge of OUR DEMAND.

Saint Dymphna and a Mad World

Dymphna is the name of the Irish Christian girl who, according to tradition, was killed by her crazed father, an Irish pagan king of the sixth century. She became the patron saint of those suffering from mental illness, and one of the most successful methods of treating the mentally afflicted has been that employed under her inspiration in Gheel, Belgium.

The Rev. Clarence Duffy, currently writing in The Protestant on the Spanish question, has founded the Society of Saint Dymphna, believing that she is an appropriate patron today for a world that has gone mad and seems intent upon its own destruction.

Father Duffy, as president of this Society, and as a priest of the Roman Catholic Church, believes with the editor of The Protestant that the immediate task above every other task today is that of bringing peace to a frightened world and that upon the U.S.A., as the greatest power in the world, devolves the duty of seeking a genuine modus vivendi with the U.S.S.R., which is its nearest rival in power and influence. Father Duffy stands forth publicly as the first priest in America to lead his people into the paths of peace. The editor of The Protestant sees in Father Duffy a worthy successor to the great Father McGlynn who was a beacon light to the Roman Catholic conscience at the turn of the century. We hope that our Roman Catholic brethren will appreciate the courage of this priest and will gather their co-religionists in their multitudes to witness with him and with the editor of The Protestant, against the counsels of hatred by joining them in signing the peace petition "Let Peace Break Out!" as printed on page 15 of this issue.

We urgently ask all our readers to sign and to obtain as many signers as possible. This is terribly, fatefully important!

THE FELLOWSHIP THAT TWISTS YOUR ARM

The Federal Council of Churches says editorially in its Bulletin (March, 1949) "Roman Catholic and Protestant interests converge in protesting the measures taken against...Roman Catholic Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary..."

Here the Federal Council misuses the word "protest," succumbing to the influences that have turned a glorious affirmative into a barren negative. This is only a straw in the wind. Here's what the wind is blowing: the Federal Council champions Mindszenty who helped Horthy fill the first concentration camp in Europe. The Federal Council goes on record in support of this pogromist cleric who tried to destroy the Republic of Hungary and put Otto Hapsburg on the necks of its people. Now Otto may be an amusing curiosity to Americans, but he does not amuse Europeans, particularly those who have known the iron heel of the Hapsburgs. There is nothing trivial about this. We cannot smile or shrug it away. We charge the Federal Council with allowing itself to be used as a tool of dynastic, ecclesiastical, and financial interests in their schemes of colonizing Europe.

John Foster Dulles remains as bell-wether for Wall Street leading the flock of innocent sheep down the dreary road of Empire. Recently at the National Study Conference on The Churches and World Order in Cleveland he made the keynote address and chaired the committee which drew up the Message.

Bleating a spurious spirituality, tinkling his meaningless phrase, "of peace, by peace, for peace" he led the churches down the dreary road of empire towards the precipice of aggressive war. His address, hypocritically entitled Leadership for Peace, ranged the conference behind a world bossed by America. As for the UN, "we can, and should, make the Charter a framework within which our leadership will be exercised in fellowship." Thus, with words like "fellowship" and "the powerhouse of faith" and "compassion" he confused, overawed and took over the churches as the U. S. is to take over the world. For the people of the world "want us to lead." "They accept that we have a certain primacy."

Dulles gives "credit" to the churches for creating a climate in which we have armed half the world against the Soviet Union. In fact he fears we may perhaps have been too obvious in our aggression. He says "our fellowship...ought not to seem to bring United States military might directly to Russia's border." He doesn't say "ought not to bring" but "ought not to seem to bring." Did the diplomat slip here in exposing his desire to deceive? Or did he want to share with the naive clergy some of the thrills of Machiavellian statesmanship? At any rate he let them know what he means by "fellowship."

Dulles admits that "at times, it may be necessary to risk war to win peace." It is the job of the military to "make sure that if there is a war, they will win it." But the military "do not know how to use, perhaps powerfully, perhaps delicately, the enormous possibilities for peace that reside in moral and economic forces..."

Now Dulles knows that an economic blockade is no more peace than a military bombardment. Dulles doesn't actually mean peace when he couples "moral" with "economic." Dulles is familiar with "economics" and knows how to apply economic force. He knows better than the military how to make that kind of war that uses economic force "perhaps powerfully" (starve them outright) "perhaps delicately" (starve them a little) and his hand would be quite steady drawing the cord of economic strangulation. Dulles cannot afford to be squeamish, for it takes just as much "Christian" fortitude to starve a child to death as to tear it apart with bombs. Remember Guernica?

THE NEW RISE OF CHRISTIAN ANTI-SEMITISM

The Protestant for ten years fought anti-Semitism as a specifically Christian form of antisocial criminality.

We have been opposed by incurably anti-Semitic Christians and by certain Jewish organizations which because of temporary common interests in the war against socialism have appeased these incurably anti-Semitic Christians and thus participated in the crime. One appeasement took the form of killing The Protestant.

They haven't killed us yet. But they have made us sick. And still do. Yet while we breathe at all they are uneasy. We are the flaw in their perfect crime. We must be silenced so that they may go on selling their people down the river for money. Ah well! They are tying their own necktie, for their people are getting wise to them. The pogromist Mindszenty! The happy strike-breaker Spellman! These are their champions. Look on the cover of this issue and see what Hungarian Jewry thinks of this betrayal. And it is not only Hungarian Jews who testify. It is Hungarian Baptists, Unitarians, Evangelicals, Lutherans, Reformed, and the Freemasons. All say Mindszenty was a traitor and that religion was never so FREE as now in Hungary.

Our point is that appeasement condones crime and participates in crime. The Protestant fought effectively. It hit. It hurt. It never played into the hands of the enemy by pretending that anti-Semitism was a disease and that the diseased wanted to be cured. We knew that the whole paraphernalia of long-range educational methods were diversion pure and simple. Anti-Semitism is a crime. To yield to its blackmail is to commit suicide and to condemn our children to the tender mercy of the American fascists.

Here's the pay-off. Read and weep! The American Christian Palestine Committee (Zionist-financed) came into being with Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr as one of its moving spirits and treasurer. The same edits "Christianity and Crisis" whose Feb. 21 issue carried a leading editorial (initialed H.S.C.) on re-born Israel. Here's the gist of it: The desire of the Jews for a nation of their own has been a "stimulation of anti-Semitism." Israel has a "parasitic economic basis" and may be a "peril" to the U.S.A. Jews in America will become hyphenates. "No greater blunder could have been made by American Jewry than to espouse Zionism if it wished to do away with anti-Semitism in this country." The editorial deprecates "emotional hysteria" and "ruthless thrusts against the unhappy peaceful Moslem and Christian Arabs whose misfortune is to live within areas on which they have set covetous eyes." "Let us not forget that there are some 350,000,000 Moslems, stretching from the Adriatic out to the South Pacific, and that Israel has their cordial illwill as the wretched people who, received in kindness by Moslem powers, has repaid hospitality with cruel hostility and driven thousands of pitiable Moslems from their homes into poverty and exile. Unfortunately for the United States of America we come in for a full share of this wide-spread Moslem bitterness."

This essay in malicious prejudice we leave with our readers. And we cite another item: Pound (or Bollingen). The Bollingen Foundation, financed by the Mellon family, publishes belles lettres and gives prizes, having just given the pro-fascist poet Ezra Pound a prize. It is no accident that this foundation bears the name of the Swiss home and workshop of the anti-Semitic psychologist Carl G. Jung who glorified the Nazis and edited a journal for them. Why do the Mellons want to spread the influence of Jung in America? Are they taking over the legacy of hate from Henry Ford bringing it up to a "cultural" level? These three items, Mindszenty supported by the American interfaith, Niebuhr and Pound, covering a very wide sector of American cultural and religious life, are enough to show that a new Christian anti-Semitic wind is blowing in America.

HIERARCHY OVER WASHINGTON

By THOMAS BLEDSOE

(Concluded from February issue)

Now we go to the Loyalty Board hearings themselves to witness the procedure of the New Inquisition.

In "Washington Witch Hunt," (by Bert Andrews, Random House, 1948. Andrews, chief Washington correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune, won the Pulitzer Prize for Journalism in 1947) Mr. Andrews tells the full story of Mr. Blank, "the all-disguising name of...a real man...so real, in fact, that he could be you or me, and the things that happened to him—and are still happening to him—could befall you or me." In these pages you see Mr. Blank discharged from the State Department under the President's Loyalty Order as "a potential security risk" without ever being informed of the nature of the charges against him and without ever being confronted by his accusers.

The transcript of the hearing finally given Mr. Blank by a State Department committee parallels so closely the inquisitorial mentality and procedure set forth in the pages of Lea's study of the Inquisition that this contemporary version should be read in its entirety. The parallel is complete, even to the crafty questions and deceit employed by the earlier inquisitors and their arrogant assumption of infallibility along with the guilt of the accused.

After a delay of months, the State Department, under pressure from an aroused public opinion, the press and attorneys, announced that Mr. Blank and six others would be allowed to resign without prejudice "in order to avoid a possible injustice to them." But when these employees received letters from the State Department accepting their resignations, the words "without prejudice" were missing. This follows the Inquisition policy of reprieving but never pardoning the accused.

In the case of Mr. Blank, one more parallel between the new and the original Inquisition must be noted. After outright torture and condemnation, victims of the original Inquisition were handed over to the secular arm for final punishment. Mr. Blank found himself experiencing the contemporary version of this procedure. It is the mental torture, attendant punishment and disability of a man forced as he was from Government employment and faced with the near impossibility of finding another job. Even though having letters of recommendation from prominent Washington officials, including the State Department, and the intervention of powerful friends, it was almost a year before Mr. Blank could find employment. His statement of the punishment suffered by him and his family is published at length in "Washington Witch Hunt." The following are Mr. Blank's concluding words:

"By now all my liquid funds are exhausted. I have spent my savings, annual leave and pension funds. Fortunately, when I first came to Washington, I bought the house I am now living in. I have recently mortgaged it to the hilt to obtain the money necessary to feed my family....

"...day-to-day job hunting is not a complete picture of what happens to a man out of work. The anxiety, uncertainty, tension and suspense that are borne every moment of every day telescope into a severe burden over a protracted period of time. The constant strain of worry over financial insecurity develops short-tempers and impatience, making it difficult to withstand the outburst of energy and noise so natural to children. They therefore become at times the unfair outlet for their parents' anxiety.

"To all this must be added my realization that I was unjustly deprived of my job..."

A statement by Lea made out of his knowledge of the Inquisition and the fate of its victims applies with full force to Mr. Blank and to his increasing number of fellow-sufferers under the President's Loyalty Order. "That a man against whom nothing substantial was proved should be punished merely because he was suspected of guilt may seem to modern eyes a scant measure of justice; but to the inquisitor it appeared a wrong to God and man that any one should escape against whose orthodoxy there rested a shadow of a doubt. Like much else taught by the Inquisition, this found its way into general criminal law, which it perverted for centuries."

Lea writing as an American historian in the latter part of the nineteenth century did not visualize the existence of such conditions in the United States of 1948 resulting from the ligation now evident between Vatican and White House.

Our brief attendance at Loyalty Board hearings, made possible through the report of attorney for the defense, Hon. O. John Rogge, will establish further links between the medieval Inquisition and that instituted by the President. ("The Mundt Bill," a speech in manuscript by O. John Rogge.)

Rogge tells of the case of a civilian employee of the Army who received, without warning, the following letter:

"Paragraph 1. You are dismissed for reasons which are confidential.

"Paragraph 2. You are given five days to answer the charges in Paragraph 1."

Appearing before the Loyalty Board with another client, a machinist, Rogge asked if the Board was "supposed to pass on this man's loyalty on the basis of evidence it does not even have before it?"

The Board replied, "...You are in a position where you do have difficulty in explaining the facts without meeting the accuser. We don't even know who the accuser is."

Witnesses for the accused in hearings where Rogge was attorney for the defense were usually asked whether they were members of the Communist Party. They all stated that they were not. Rogge points out, however, that in a case where a witness "was a Legionnaire and a Catholic, the Board stated with emphasis as he was leaving that they did not need to ask him the question."

The accused, however, was asked whether he was "a member of the Progressive Citizens of America?"

In another hearing, the accused was asked, "Have you ever associated with any employees who, because of their political tendencies, might be considered Communist?"

He answered, "So far as I know, the answer is no. You can hardly expect me to know the political opinions or tendencies of everybody I talk to."

The Board asked, "You don't know whether your father or mother or sister is a Communist or what their feelings are?"

The accused answered, "As far as I know, they are not."

He was also asked, "Don't they discuss politics at the family gatherings?"

He was asked what newspapers he read, and what made him subscribe to the Book Find Club rather than to the Book-of-the-Month Club.

He was asked about the works of Lion Feuchtwanger, Theodore Dreiser and Howard Fast, to which the Board added, "What we are getting at is this, Mr.—: some of those writers which have been mentioned adhere to the Communist Party line. Did you know that?"

The accused replied that he did not know anything about that. Then he was asked if he would say that the writers "adopted a very liberal attitude?" And that, "They weave political doctrine into a story."

His reply was, "I ain't that much of a genius. I read the words; not the weaving."

The Board asked him about his wife and where she was born. In the Bronx, he told them.

"Did you," they asked, "ever attend any social affairs with your wife—organizations or associations where Communist Party doctrines were discussed?"

"No," he replied.

"Or liberal views were discussed?"

Again he replied, "No."

"Would you say that your wife has liberal political viewpoints?"

"Yes," he answered, "just as I have. I am not denying that."

Another question the Board asked was, "Have you registered American Labor Party?"

"I have registered Democratic and American Labor Party on different occasions," he replied.

In another case the accused was asked, "In your recollection, do you recall ever discussing any topic which might be sympathetic to Communist doctrine?" He replied, "Yes."

"Would you care to state what it was and who it was made to?"

"I have been sick for years," he replied, "and so I have discussed what they call nationalized medicine....I have always harped on free medicine and old age pensions and things like that."

He was also asked if he had ever discussed the Truman Doctrine and what he thought of it.

Attorney for the defense interrupted, stating to the Board that he was "unfamiliar with the procedure" and that it was "difficult to know whether" these were "hypothetical questions of an investigatory nature or based on facts which are based on evidence which you have and which we will have an opportunity to examine."

"The only information available to you," he was told, "is what you can deduce from the questions I present. It is based on facts and evidence in our possession."

"Have you ever read or subscribed to 'The Protestant'?" the Board asked the accused.

He replied that he did not know what it was. Then he was asked what he thought of "the third party formed by Henry Wallace?"

"Mr.—," the Board stated, "apparently you came over with your parents when you were quite young. Do you recall whether they ever affiliated themselves politically with any party?"

The first witness this accused presented on his behalf was his son-in-law, who is a Catholic. The Board asked him, "Do you know how many sacraments there are?"

"There are ten," he replied.

"There are seven," the Board corrected him.

Then there was the case, Rogge continues, of a woman where, "after none of the bits of gossip and hearsay panned out, the exasperated inquisitor asked: 'Isn't it possible that subconsciously you are in favor of communism?'"

There was also the case of an atomic scientist against whom the charge went as follows:

"A former landlord of yours has reported that in 1943, after you moved from the premises in which you had been residing, certain magazines and pamphlets which may have been left on the premises by you may have included a copy

of the magazine, 'New Masses.'"

The last case reported by Rogge involved a discharged employee of a private corporation that has a government contract. This man is an engineer whose work was so essential that the company arranged for his deferment during the war. But recently the government told the company that he must be dismissed for security reasons. As in all these cases, the employee does not know why. He asked to be permitted to resign. This was denied. He requested a letter of recommendation. The president of the company gave him one, but stated in it that the company had to dismiss him for security reasons at the request of the Government. This clearly is equivalent to an economic death sentence for anyone.

Our brief attendance at these Loyalty Board hearings takes us straight into the pages of original works complete with procedure and technique of questioning written by two great Inquisitors. Lea cites them with abhorrence; Walsh, the apologist, with applause. In his "Practica," Bernard Gui is especially concerned that the inquisitor "circumvent the crafty evasions of the heretical...so that with God's help the winding serpent may be drawn from the cesspool and abyss of errors by an obstetrical hand." Some had better be detained a good while and questioned repeatedly, "first, that they may often be invited to conversion, for...when they are converted, they disclose everything and lay open the truth, and reveal all their accomplices, whence follows great fruit."

Another great Inquisitor, Nicholas Eymeric, expanded Gui's "Practica" into the voluminous "Directorium Inquisitorum" which, in the words of Walsh, "for centuries to come, would be to all Inquisitors what Blackstone would be to Britons, a guide, a precedent, a treasure of practical advice." Walsh, to whom we cannot take exception in this matter, paraphrases the Inquisitor's guide as follows:

"Pin him down, says Eymeric, by explicit questions and demand explicit answers. Or be bland with him, profess sympathy that he has been deceived in his simplicity, and offer to be his teacher. Have some testimony of the witnesses read to him, without names, and watch his reactions. Glance at the process with a look of astonishment, as if to say, 'It is clear you are not telling me the truth.' Pretend you have to go away and don't know when you will be able to return. Meanwhile what a pity it is that he has to remain in prison! [Or as it is today, come back for another hearing.] He is a delicate man, and may get sick, and you are very sorry for him. If he would only tell all he knows, and get it over with! Yes, this is subterfuge, admits Eymeric...[but] Anything is good, says Eymeric in effect, that brings about conversion and penitence of a heretic."

So the pattern is set for the inquisitorial mentality whether of the Middle Ages or in the Loyalty Board hearings of 1947 and 48.

One more point before we leave these hearings. It concerns the questions asked about the political opinions and affiliations of parents, other relatives and wives, and where they were born. This parallels the test of "limpieza," or "clean blood," developed with especial fanaticism during the Spanish Inquisition. The ancestry of the accused was investigated for the taint of Jewish or Moorish "blood." Even though the ancestor had been converted to Catholicism, the "mancha," or stain, held for the accused. But "clean blood" was not confined to Catholic biological racism. "Clean blood" was also ideological. An ancestor condemned as a heretic or in any lesser way involved in the toils of the Inquisition, "stained" the blood of his descendants.

Entry into certain guilds, into colleges, the professions, the Church—including service in the Inquisition—and public office was closed to those who bore

the fatal "mancha" or stain. Property rights, including even inheritance of many entailed estates, were based upon this mania for absolute purity of blood. The fatal stain was contracted by marriage to a wife who was herself stained.

The sordid parallel of inquisitors and their agents falling out among themselves also prevails between the original Inquisition and its new version. From hunting heretics, sympathizers and protectors of heretics, and orthodox Catholics of Jewish and Moorish descent, the Inquisition turned upon itself. Its officials rent one another as cruelly as they had punished their avowed enemies. The Mendicant Orders to whom the institution had been entrusted fought among themselves, jealous of privileges. Inquisitors fought with bishops, imprisoned and starved them. Popes turned the Inquisition upon cardinals and other members of the hierarchy who aroused their anger. So this mighty instrument whose institution some attempt to justify as necessary to preserve the unity of Christendom through purgation of heretics, their associates and those of "unclean blood," became the instrument of personal vengeance and disruption.

Dramatic parallels exist in the New Inquisition. A member of Congress demanded that Hamilton Robinson, who sat in the inquisitorial seat during the Loyalty hearing of Mr. Blank's case, be purged. Robinson was discovered to have an allegedly leftist second cousin. This family connection, over which Robinson naturally had no control, presumably stained his "limpieza," rendering him of "unclean blood": his loyalty was suspect. Fellow inquisitors in the State Department rushed to Robinson's defense. He is a member of an old family, belongs to the New York Republican Club, and is a Princeton, Oxford and Yale Law School man. The Congressional inquisitors persisted however, and Robinson resigned.

The persecution of the distinguished scientist, Dr. Edward U. Condon, by Thomas and his House Un-American Activities Committee, aided by the pro-military clique, affords another example of the inquisitors falling out among themselves. The FBI file on Condon, who was caught in a feud between executive and legislative inquisitors, was refused the Thomas Committee by President Truman. The House recently passed a resolution directing the Secretary of Commerce to give up this file to its Committee.

The inquisitorial House Committee with its sub-committees—and now various state and municipal committees patterned after that of the House—conform to the same prototype as the President's Loyalty Order: The Holy Inquisition. This is also true of such proposed legislation as the Mundt-Nixon Bill and the revised version of it printed in the "Congressional Record," June 19, 1948, at the request of Senator Wiley along with his statement urging its further study.

Rising out of such parallels are these questions: Did an obstetrical Catholic hand guide the hand of the Baptist Truman when he penned his Loyalty Order? How much longer will American citizens—of all creeds and of no creed—permit the violation of their constitutional rights by the inquisitorial procedure already operating in the executive and legislative branches of government and further proposed?

Of the original Inquisition, the Franciscan Bernard Delicieux, declared in the presence of the French king and his court that if St. Peter and St. Paul were prosecuted after the fashion of the Inquisition all defense would be closed to them. Even those, the devout friar added, who wished to aid these holy apostles would themselves be attacked as protectors of heresy. Comparable to the friar's declaration is that of Rogge: "The House Committee would regard such Americans as Thomas Jefferson, Tom Paine and Abraham Lincoln, were they alive today, as Un-American."

During his testimony against the Mundt-Nixon Bill before the Senate Committee in Washington, Rogge applied the inquisitorial technique contained in the bill to members of the House Committee which sponsored it. "The Committee," Rogge said, "should ask Congressman Mundt whether it isn't a fact that Mundt pridefully stated that the blueprint for the course which the House Committee followed was laid down by John W. Davis, the Wall Street lawyer for J. P. Morgan." When asked where he got this information, Rogge replied that it came from the "Congressional Record."

Of Thomas—himself symbol incarnate perhaps of the New Inquisition: Feeney turned Thomas, Catholic turned Episcopalian who attends the Methodist Church ("The 'Americanization' of J. Parnell Thomas," by Croswell Bowen, PM, November 30, 1947.)—Rogge stated, "This Committee should ask Congressman Thomas whether it isn't a fact that he, Thomas, with his brother-in-law, Ralph Tyner, Jr., and another, joined the Ku Klux Klan in Paterson, New Jersey in 1925."

As for the collaboration of reactionary Protestant, Catholic and Jew in the suppression of unorthodox thought—first radical, then inevitably liberal—it is not without precedent nor is the reason for it obscure.

In Nazi Germany, Cardinal Pacelli—now Pius XII—and the Papal Chamberlain von Papen, Hitler's prized diplomat, collaborated against world peace and democracy with Protestant Prussian warlords and industrialists, Jewish financiers and atheist Nazi politicians.

In the United States, Wall Street links Vatican to White House. The results of this collaboration are now evident in the New Inquisition we witness.

The drive is towards war and against those whose heresy is peace. The drive is for the extirpation of economic, political and constitutional rights. The loyal are the orthodox—politically, racially and, to follow, religiously. The disloyal are the heretics. Criminal in a lesser degree are those whose loyalty is suspect and those guilty of associating with heretics.

Growing out of the New Inquisition against the unorthodox—the progressive forces for peace and abundance—is a whole new class of heretics with their sympathizers and associates. Their number is creating a new kind and class of the dispossessed, comparable to the numerous pariah class of heretics and their associates created by the original Inquisition. The modern pariahs, as their medieval fellows, expelled from public employment find private employment all but closed to them. The goods of medieval heretics and their associates were confiscated, their houses pulled down, their business transactions halted. The modern pariah is deprived of his goods—the ability to earn a living. His house is not torn down literally, but socially and economically his family is rent asunder. The effects of the original Inquisition upon commerce, family life, civil rights, science, and the life of the mind were all but disastrous.

The same effects will befall us as a nation under the New Inquisition unless we, progressive Catholics, Protestants, Jews, those of other creeds and of no creed, unite as American citizens to preserve our rights guaranteed by the Constitution as the only basis of religious freedom, democracy and world peace. Only so can further realization of Kenneth Leslie's tragic prophecy under the New Inquisition be prevented.

THE CHURCH-STATE ISSUE IN SPAIN

by THE REV. FATHER CLARENCE DUFFY

(Concluded from February issue)

In the elections of February 1936 the C.E.D.A.* through sympathetic civil governors and mayors controlled most of the provinces and cities and, therefore, most of the polling booths of Spain. Falsification of returns or tampering with the votes by the parties of the Left was, therefore, impossible and must be ruled out.

The parties of the Left, and the Catholic Basque Nationalists who made common cause with them, obtained 4,838,499 votes; parties of the Center received 449,320 votes, and the parties of the Right secured 3,996,931 votes.

Manuel Portela Valederes, leader of the Center group, was Prime Minister at the time of the election. Picked by Zamora who never trusted Robles sufficiently to permit him to form a government, Portela was not a Leftist and was not in favor with the Left. Like Zamora and the majority of the people of Spain, he was a Republican intent on upholding the Republic while at the same time being opposed to the extreme anti-clerical, secularist legislation previously introduced or contemplated by the Leftists. Gil Robles was Minister of War in his cabinet which was composed of members from the Center and the Right.

After the elections Portela refused to make common cause with the parties of the Right. Even had he joined forces with the latter, the Leftists or Popular Front parties would still have had a large majority over all other parties combined. The Government's own returns for the elections gave 258 deputies to the parties of the Left, 62 deputies to the Center and 152 deputies to the Right, a fairly accurate reflection of the popular vote.

The Leftists of Spain legitimately won the elections of 1936. That is an historical fact which must be faced and admitted by everyone. Another fact that must be faced and admitted by everyone, and particularly by Catholics, is that the Spanish Government formed and headed by Azana, following the resignation of Portela, was the legitimate government of Spain.

What happened afterwards — how and why Zamora was ousted from the Presidency, how and why the majority of the Socialists went over to the extreme Left, and the Leftist anti-clericals became even more anti-clerical and secularist than formerly — does not and cannot affect that fact.

Catholic doctrine on the subject of government is directly involved here, and Catholic doctrine on that subject, propounded incidentally by, among others, two Spaniards, Vitoria and Suarez, is definitely on the side of the Azana regime which legitimately took over the government of Spain in February 1936.

The Catholic people of Spain, including their priests and Bishops, were bound in conscience, according to the teachings of the Catholic Church, to accept the Azana government as the lawful government of Spain and to treat it as such until it was replaced in a constitutional manner by another government, even if that meant waiting for another election. Irrespective of the past record of Azana, or of the manner in which he and his government proceeded again to separate Church and State, and even to penalise the former, or at least to penalise its spokesmen and adherents, they were bound to recognize and obey the government of Azana in all things in which it had authority and in which it did not demand or command something contrary to natural and Divine laws.

* Confederacion Espanola de Derechos Autonomos, which professed to be inspired by the teachings of the Catholic Church in political, social and economic matters.

Even if they considered that government inimical or perverse, they were still bound to recognize it, irrespective of the number of churches that were burned by Republican mobs, or of the numbers of people who were beaten or killed in the bitter reprisals which followed the elections of 1936, reprisals, incidentally for which Monarchist and Falangist mobs were as much responsible as their Republican counterparts.

To the voices of St. Robert Bellarmine, Vitoria, Suarez and numerous other approved Catholic moralists and theologians, as well as to the voices of several Popes, all of whom have expounded doctrines on which the foregoing statements are based, the writer would like to add the voice of St. Peter, the man upon whom Christ established His Church.

In his First Epistle, Chapter 2, St. Peter then in Rome, and living under an inimical and persecuting government, wrote as follows to his fellow Christians:

"Be ye subject, therefore, to every human creature for God's sake: whether it be to the king as excelling or to governors as sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of the good; for so is the will of God, that by doing well you may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men; as free and as not making liberty a cloak for malice, but as the servants of God.

"Honour all men; love the brotherhood; fear God; honour the king.

"Servants be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle but also the severe.

"For this is thankworthy, if for conscience towards God, a man endures sorrows suffering wrongfully.

"For what glory is it, if committing sin, and being buffetted for it, you endure? But if doing well you suffer patiently, this is thankworthy before God.

"For unto this are you called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving you an example that you should follow in His steps."

Had the Catholic people of Spain followed Christian teachings they would have accepted and recognized the Azana government no matter what the consequences might have been to them. A Christian can live as a Christian under any form of government, and under any and every kind of environment. In fact the worse the environment the greater is the opportunity to live as a true Christian. Had they done so, the whole course of history would have been altered. There would have been no civil war in Spain. World War II might not have happened. True Christian Democracy might today be triumphant in a world which, divided into two separate warring camps, is faced with another war and possible annihilation.

Many of the Catholic people of Spain, particularly those of the upper middle and upper classes, the landlords and industrialists or employers of labor, the Army officers, especially the Generals, and many of the clergy did not accept the expressed will of the majority of the people of Spain. Shortly after the elections Portela was approached by representative Rightists who asked him to become a dictator with their support. He indignantly refused. Thereafter the Generals began to plot and plan a minority revolt against the legal Spanish government.

During the first five months following the elections, Spain was torn by internal strife. Republican partisans, incensed at the attitude of most of the clergy towards the Republic, burned churches and maltreated priests and Rightist lay men. Rightist mobs, who were more to blame than the Republicans who did not profess to be following Christian teachings, retaliated in various ways. Murders and reprisals followed. Abyss called unto and was answered by abyss. The Christians on either side in Spain were few and far between.

The culminating point of this mob violence, of crime and reprisal, was reached on July 12, 1936, when Calvo Sotelo, a prominent Monarchist deputy, was slain by Leftists in revenge for the killing of a Socialist police captain by a Monarchist mob. This was the incident for which the conspiring Army Generals, including Francisco Franco, had been waiting, the excuse for the revolt which they previously planned.

Franco was Chief of Staff of the Army during the latter days of the C.E.D.A. regime. He was appointed to that position by Gil Robles who was Minister of War. As Chief of Staff he was responsible for the ruthless, savage suppression of a Leftist revolt in the province of Asturias in which he used Moors and mercenaries of the Spanish Foreign Legion to kill the revolting Republican Asturians. The Azana government transferred him to an Army command in the Canary Islands from which he was flown by a British plane to Spanish Morocco immediately after the murder of Sotelo. On July 19 Spanish Morocco, called the "Army's parade ground," was in open revolt against the Republic. The revolt was led by General Franco who was again in command of his Legionnaires composed of Moors and Spanish mercenaries.

The revolt in Spain, timed to coincide with the revolt in Morocco, misfired badly. Most of the twelve thousand officers and eighty-five generals on the Army's active list were ready to join the revolt and fight the Republic which they had sworn to defend. So were many of the ten thousand officers and over four hundred generals on the retired list, but the vast majority of the fifty thousand conscript soldiers who composed the Spanish Army in Spain proper refused to follow their officers in revolt.

The Spanish Navy remained loyal to the Republic and prevented the movement of rebel troops across the Strait of Gibraltar from Morocco to the Spanish mainland where the revolting Generals and officers with the few troops on which they could rely were fighting a losing battle in the isolated garrisons and scattered territory affected by the revolt which had failed in Madrid, Barcelona, Bilbao and Valencia, the four principal cities of Spain. In Republican territory the people were arming, or being armed by the Government, to defend the Republic.

It was at this crucial moment in the future history of Spain, and of the world, that a German Nazi, Johannes Bernhardt, manager of a German firm in Tetuan, appeared on the scene. He met Franco at the Tetuan airport on July 19 when the latter arrived from the Canary Islands and gave him a personal letter from Adolf Hitler. He informed Franco that a German plane was waiting to take his reply back to Hitler who had offered to help Franco to overthrow the Republican government of Spain.

The German plane waited for two days during which Franco looked at the Republican warships patrolling the Strait, inspected the few planes at his disposal, and read the discouraging reports from the hard-pressed revolting Generals on the Spanish Peninsula. At the end of two days he made his decision. As a result of it, a few days later thirty German troop transport planes complete with crews arrived in Spanish Morocco.

On July 28 General Mola (in command of the revolting Catholic Carlists from Navarre who were holding the passes leading to Madrid from the north) received the following message from Franco in Africa: "We are masters of the Strait. All is well."

At the time he received the message he was writing an order calling the Carlists back from the passes and preparing for eventual defeat.

That night German planes were unloading Spanish Foreign Legionnaires,

many of them Moors, on the airport of Sevilla, a key city of Southern Spain, held tenuously, and largely by bluffing broadcasts, by General Quiepo de Llano with barely two thousand men on most of whom he could not rely.

On the following day stores of arms and ammunition were on their way to General Mola who a few days previously had issued the following message to his troops: "Not one shot more. I have only twenty-six thousand cartridges for the whole Northern Army."

German planes and war equipment were later followed by German manpower. Fascist Italy moved quickly in the wake of the Nazis, and eventually the Spanish Republic was destroyed, not by the majority of the people of Spain who fought like demons to maintain the Republic but by a rebel minority calling itself Catholic, and therefore Christian, that violated Christian teachings and accepted the aid of un-Christian and even anti-Christian foreign dictators interested only in the promotion of their own vile interests and ambitions.

In justification of the Rightist revolt against the Spanish government many people, and especially many Catholics inside and outside of Spain, brought forward the argument that the Spanish government was communistic, and that the Rightist revolt led by Franco, who later became a dictator, saved Spain from Communism.

The Spanish government against which Franco led a revolt was not communistic either in composition or purpose. Among the 258 deputies of the parties of the Left from which the government was formed there were only sixteen communists, and most of these were at that time "libertarian" communists, or Anarchists, rather than Marxian communists. The Spanish government and the vast majority of the Leftist deputies were anti-clerical and many of them were secularists. Because of that they were called Communists. They were not Communists. They were Republicans who wanted to maintain the Republic, to enact and enforce necessary land reforms including the breaking up and distribution of the large estates, to separate the Church and State, to strip Churchmen and Church organizations of unnecessary property and privilege, to bring education and health services within the reach of all Spaniards, to control the industrialists, big business, and the Army in the interests of the people of Spain. All of this is in keeping with Christian teaching.

Unfortunately, however, these objectives were bound up with bitter anti-clericalism and secularism for which the clergy themselves were largely responsible. Anti-clericalism and secularism, however, are not confined to communists and are not in themselves communistic.

It is true that the majority of the Socialists under Largo Caballero later went over to the extreme Left, that the Republican government received help from communists and from Soviet Russia, and that it eventually was controlled or dominated by Communists. That these things happened was due not to the fact that the majority of the Spanish people approved of Communism but to the chain of circumstances which forced them to accept aid from any quarter from which they could get it in order to save the Republic which they cherished.

* * * * * * * *

The following booklets by the author of the above article may be obtained from the Rev. Clarence Duffy, 128 Manhattan Ave., New York 25, N. Y.:

A Farm In Ireland (35¢)
It Happened In Ireland (35¢)
"Deliver Us From Evil" (25¢)
"...Into The Way Of Peace" (35¢)
All four for $1.00.

LET PEACE BREAK OUT!

Petition to President Truman to Institute a Conference Between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. to End the Cold War

The impassable road-block to world peace is the Cold War between the U.S.A., leading one group of nations, and the U.S.S.R., leading another.

The development of this conflict is pulling the world apart and preventing lesser nations from taking any intermediate position between these polar opposites and from making any genuine contributions of their own to the construction of peace.

Not only does this growing tension violate the freedom of the human soul but it drives each of these great world antagonists to a greater use of force and to the rapid abandonment of reason.

The workaday people of all countries believe that this Cold War betrays the peace and is unworthy of those to whom they have entrusted their lives. Their common sense tells them that while this impasse remains the threat hangs heavy over their heads of atomic and bacterial death.

They know that the end of this road will mean civil strife, the negation of human freedom and the suppression of all minorities everywhere.

They know that our present temporary economic well-being, dependent upon the building of weapons of war, faces the dead-end of depression with its revolting 'solution' in mass slaughter.

There is no way forward on this road, Mr. President! To retreat from a wrong course takes the highest courage. Follow your oft-expressed impulse to make personal contact with the Soviet leaders. Heed not the worshippers of Mammon, the servitors of gold. Heed the people and they will bless you!

In their name we ask you to institute a meeting at once between responsible agents of the two governments involved and keep that meeting in session until a way has been found for these powers to inhabit the earth peaceably. Call the meeting now! Let peace break out!

Cut out and send to THE PROTESTANT, 128 Manhattan Avenue, New York 25, N. Y.

I hereby sign the petition to President Truman "Let Peace Break Out" sponsored by Father Clarence Duffy and Kenneth Leslie.

Name.....

(If minister, please specify church).....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

Name.....

Address.....

MARCH THE PROTESTANT 1949

Editor, Kenneth Leslie Secretary, Katherine Kastorea

Associate Editors
John Hammond Luther Macnair John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Ruth Nanda Anshen
William T. Baird
Lee H. Ball
Russell C. Barbour
Reginald H. Bass
C. Harrison Becker
Adam Bhilippovsky
Otto Brand
Henrietta Buckmaster
R. Alex Cameron
George Conner
Boise Dent
Joseph F. Fletcher
Paul J. Folino
Erwin A. Gaede
A. Eustace Haydon
Chester E. Hodgson
Daniel Hughes
Hewlett Johnson
J. Spencer Kennard, Jr.
Frederick D. Kershner
Stanton Lautenschlager
John A. Lee
David Lord
Edward D. McGowan
Joseph G. Moore
J. Murdock Palmer
Dryden L. Phelps
A. Clayton Powell
Ida Pruit
Joseph A. Rabun
Leslie Roberts
Raymond Robins

THE PROTESTANT is , PROTESTANT DI Editorial and Executive Offices attan Avenue, New York 2 ENNETH LESLIE, Managing Di y subscription only. 12 issue issues $5.00 in the United Stat outh America. 25¢ per copy; 25¢ postage in Canada and foreign c les. Reentered as second class nuary 10, 1949, at the post office at York, N. Y., under the Act of Mar . Printed in U.S.A. Copyright, 1949 Protestant Digest, Inc. The Na mittee of Protestant Associates the Chairmanship of John Ha voluntary group of laymen assist he publication of THE PROT ributions for this purpose should de to the order of THE PRO

Father Clarence Duffy y won damages and full it against an officer of Local 32B Building Service Emp' Union because of alleged comme rogatory to his status

SHAME THE DE

We gladly anno that Febr onse of January. But find i pe Some are contributing ar do sc scrip- tions are increasing. But te US SNAP OUT OF IT! Let us not anticipate lysis of fear! Lives end but life goes on. While we're LET US LIVE! Through support of The Protestant let us tell the truth and shame the Devil!